DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 348 FL 013 366

AUTHOR Buteau, M.; Gougeon, H.
TITLE Evaluation of the Bilingual Kindergarten and Follow Up Programs: St. Joseph Elementary School, Town of Mount Royal. Third Progress Report.
INSTITUTION McGill Univ., Montreal (Quebec). Faculty of Education.
PUB DATE Aug 82
NOTE 91p.; For second progress report, see ED 208 662.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Bilingual Education Programs; Bilingualism; Communicative Competence (Languages); Educational Research; *French; Language Research; Primary Education; *Program Evaluation; *Second Language Programs; Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Quebec (Town of Mount Royal)

ABSTRACT

The third progress report is presented on the evaluation of a bilingual kindergarten program and a social studies follow-up program in grades 1 and 2. The focus is on the first cohort, presently in grade 2, on a second cohort in grade 1, and on a third cohort in kindergarten. The purpose of the program was to initiate French instruction in kindergarten in order to prepare students for the integrated social studies program and for eventual immersion in grade 6. The three parts of the report focus on the assessment of pupil achievement; participants, instruments and testing procedures; test results; and evaluation of program objectives. The extensive analyses indicate that pupil progress in content knowledge, in English, and in French was significant. The students had acquired general notions and knowledge in social studies while learning as much English and substantially more French than the pupils following the regular English program. From the point of view of parents and teachers, the program was considered advantageous. Statistics, sample questionnaires, and testing instruments are appended. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED225348

THIRD PROGRESS REPORT

EVALUATION OF THE BILINGUAL KINDERGARTEN AND FOLLOW UP PROGRAMS

ST. JOSEPH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

TOWN OF MOUNT ROYAL

SUBMITTED BY

M. BUTEAU

H. GOUGEON

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Buteau
H. Gougeon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TO

THE ST. CROIX SCHOOL COMMISSION

AUGUST, 1982

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

MCGILL UNIVERSITY

MONTREAL, QUEBEC

FL 013 366

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
1. INTRODUCTION.	1
2. EVALUATION OF PUPILS.	3
2.1 METHODOLOGY.	3
2.1.1 Plan of Testing	3
2.1.2 Subjects.	4
2.1.3 Tests	6
2.1.4 Statistical Treatment of Data	10
2.2 PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	10
2.1.1 Kindergarten.	10
2.2.2 Grade One	13
2.2.3 Grade Two	18
3. EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS.	21
3.1 THE BILINGUAL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM	21
3.2 THE INTEGRATED SOCIAL STUDIES PROGRAMS	25
4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS.	32
NOTES	39
TABLES.	41
APPENDICES.	64

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the third in a series of progress reports[1,2] on the evaluation of a bilingual kindergarten program and a Social Studies follow-up program in grade one and in grade two. The 1981-1982 evaluation focuses on the first cohort which is currently in grade two, on a second cohort in grade one and on a third cohort in kindergarten.

The Bilingual Kindergarten project was first implemented in 1979-1980 at the request of parents who wished to provide the kindergarten pupils with an intensive first experience in French without infringing on the English component of the kindergarten. It was hoped that an integrated Social Studies program introduced in grades one and two would enhance the French acquired in kindergarten and would better prepare pupils for the French Social Studies program in grades three through five and for the total French immersion program in grade six.

The project has been founded in part by the Quebec Ministry of Education and has been administered and coordinated by individuals associated with the St. Croix School Commission (see revised table of distribution of responsibilities Appendix A). In addition, substantial financial support was provided by the parents through the efforts of the St. Joseph School Committee.[3]

Just as in previous years there were changes to school personnel. There was a change of principal two months into the scholastic year. A new teacher willing to take

the half-time employment on a one-year contract was hired for the French component of the kindergarten. The teacher, a new, enthusiastic graduate trained as a second language specialist, faced the rather formidable task of adjusting to a new career and a new program. In addition the teacher of the Integrated Social Studies Program in grades one and two who was new to the program and to the school sought retirement and was replaced in January by the teacher who had taught the Social Studies Program in grade one in 1980-81.

The progress of the program implementation and of the pupils following these programs was monitored informally by means of classroom visits and discussions with the teachers. The formal assessment included questionnaires to the parents of the kindergarten pupils and to the teachers of kindergarten and grades one and two. The progress of the pupils was assessed by means of classroom observation and by individual and group tests.

The remainder of this report consists of three parts. The first part focuses on the assessment of pupils achievement. Participants, instruments and testing procedures are described. Test results are presented and discussed. The second part of the report deals with the evaluation of program objectives. Some concluding remarks are provided in the final section.

2. EVALUATION OF PUPILS

The progress of the pupils was assessed by means of individual and group tests and by classroom observation. At the beginning of the scholastic year, a letter describing the nature of the program and the testing procedures and a parental consent form were forwarded to parents of children in classes designated for testing (See Appendix B for copy of letter and consent form). Children whose parents returned the consent form were tested. A description of the methodology is provided below.

2.1 METHODOLOGY

2.1.1 Plan of Testing

The number of comparison groups and the number of tests originally proposed for the 1981-82 pupil evaluation were reduced at the request of school administrators. Understandably, particularly where control groups are involved, there is some reluctance on the part of parents, teachers and administrators to relinquish class time in order to accommodate an extensive testing program. The original testing schedule and the reduced, actual testing schedule are presented in tables 1 and 2 at the end of this report. The elimination of comparison groups in grade two and the reduction of testing in kindergarten resulted in modifications to the original testing plan. The emphasis was placed on follow-up testing in grades one and two where few changes

were made to the proposed plan. At the kindergarten level, the few tests retained from the original list were those which could be pursued in the first and second grade.

Two tests (French Comprehension (OISE), French Reading) were administered to pupils in grade three at St. Joseph's. These pupils had not participated in the Bilingual Kindergarten Program nor in the follow-up Integrated Social Studies Programs. Results from this testing session will be compared to results obtained by the first cohort in 1982-83.

All tests were administered by two fluently bilingual graduate students who had experience in testing young children and who made every effort to establish a positive, nonthreatening testing atmosphere. Individual tests were conducted in a quiet, comfortable room assigned for the duration of the tests. Group tests were administered within the regular classroom and were supervised by two examiners.

2.1.2 Subjects

The pupils selected for testing spanned four levels of primary school, kindergarten through grade three and four types of programs, bilingual, reception, regular English, regular French. In grades one and two children who had attended the Bilingual Kindergarten followed an Integrated Social Studies Program for approximately fifty minutes per day.

- Kindergarten: Two groups, the pupils in the Bilingual Kindergarten and those in the Reception Kindergarten were involved in the testing. Of the sixteen pupils attending the Bilingual Kindergarten who were eligible for testing, thirteen completed all tests. The nine children in the comparison group attended the full day Reception Kindergarten at a neighboring school. These children are from English-speaking homes where parents, for the most part, are professionals.

- Grade One: Pupils who were tested the previous year at the kindergarten level were tested in grade one. The fifteen pupils who had attended the Bilingual Kindergarten were tested as well as nine new students whose results are analyzed separately. Pupils in each of the three comparison groups, Regular English (N:12), Post-reception (N:6) and Regular French (N:12) had all been tested previously in kindergarten. These pupils were attending classes in neighboring schools within the same school board.

- Grade Two: Pupils (N:9) who had attended the Bilingual Kindergarten were tested as were students who entered the school in grade one (N:7). Results for these groups are presented separately. A comparable regular English group (N:10) was also tested. A third year of testing the French language group presented insurmountable problems resulting in the elimination from the study of this important comparison group.

- Grade Three: A group of twenty-one grade three pupils who had not been exposed to the Bilingual Kindergarten Program nor to the Integrated Social Studies Programs were tested. Results of tests are presented in Appendix G but will be discussed only in the 1982-83 progress report.

2.1.3 Tests

Prior to the administration of formal tests, a language background questionnaire (see Appendix C) was completed with the assistance of the school principal. This was used for the selection of pupils for the study. In addition, a broad letter-grade rating of pupils' scholastic skills was obtained from the school register.

A description of the more conventional, standardized testing instruments, The Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices,[4] the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test[5,6] and the French Comprehension Tests, Primer[7] and Grade One[8] is available in the first two progress reports and will not be repeated here. The language survey tests of the Metropolitan Achievement Test Battery which were administered to grades one and two for the first time this year will be discussed briefly. The non-standardized tests--the Oral Language Measure (O.L.M.), the Content Examination and the Verbal Interaction analyses have been described in previous reports. Because they are measures developed specifically for the current study, a brief description of each will be provided.

- The Metropolitan Achievement Tests[9] (Language). The two survey language tests for primary one and primary two consist of items assessing listening comprehension, punctuation, capitalization, language usage, syntax and spelling. A result based on total score (maximum of 40 in primary one and of 55 in primary two) is reported.

- Oral Language Measure (O.L.M.). This oral test consists of a ten-minute, tape-recorded interview where each child responds to questions dealing with the events represented in a series of drawings. At the grade one level, the theme of the series is a family picnic and at grade two, the topic is the extinguishing of a school fire.

This is a test of oral expression which is partly structured and partly free. The child is asked to identify or describe items depicted in the drawings, to formulate possible conversations among the characters, to relate the total story and to explain a specific event depicted in one of the scenes. The ratings and parameters are similar at all levels. Each of the following five parameters were rated on a scale of 0 to 5: comprehension of an event depicted in the series, lexical development, grammatical, discursive and enunciative proficiency for the total production. One parameter - capacity for personal expression in explaining perception of an event - was rated on a scale of 0 to 3. In addition, a word count was made of English and French words based on a written transcription of taped responses.

- Content Examination. A content examination was individually administered to the Grade One and Grade Two follow-up groups at St. Joseph School. The major purpose of this oral test is to assess the extent to which the content objectives of the Integrated Social Studies and second language programs are acquired. At grade one, the test takes thirty minutes to administer and consists of questions on the notions of space, time and society which have been articulated in the intermediate objectives of the program. The children are asked to point to, name and situate in time and space, certain elements and phenomena depicted in the drawings. They are also expected to identify and explain certain relationships and to draw on their personal experiences in responding to questions. At grade two, the test takes approximately forty minutes. With the aid of pictures, the pupil is expected to show to what extent he has acquired the notions and skills taught during the year from the second book, Moi et les miens, of the Jean-Luc Picard's Social Studies series, Eveil à la réalité.[10] More specifically, the twenty-nine questions of this examination deal with man's needs (food, lodging, clothing), some immediate aspects of the family and physical environments, as well as a few professional services and trades necessary to life in society.

At both levels, appropriate responses volunteered in English are given credit. The maximum possible score at

grade one is eighty-nine and at grade two it is one hundred.

- Verbal Interaction Analysis. This is the third year in which this observational tool has been used. The observer, trained in the use of a grid (see Appendix D) is asked to record verbal events (pupil statements, questions, commands, exclamations) in as much detail as possible. Of particular interest are the frequency and direction of verbal exchanges between pupil and teacher and pupil and pupil and the language in which these exchanges are made. A reliability study conducted with data collected at the kindergarten level in 1980-1981, revealed a high inter-rater reliability (above 98%) as regards categorization of responses as either teacher or pupil directed. Designation of a verbalization as either English or French was also very accurate (over 95% agreement). Attempts at other types of categorization were less reliable and were dropped from the data collection procedure.

In kindergarten, observations were conducted during the regular activities of the afternoon (French) session. Eight pupils were observed alternately by two examiners for a total of twenty minutes in two ten-minutes, non consecutive blocks of time. One session was conducted in the late fall, another in the spring. A sample observation table is reproduced in Appendix E. A similar procedure was followed in grades one and two during the Social Studies

period. There was no fall observation session in grade two.

2.1.4 Statistical Treatment of Data

For data on which cross-group comparisons are made, an analysis of covariance procedure using Raven as covariate is employed. Where more than two groups are compared, an appropriate multiple comparisons test is used following a significant F. Where small subgroups are compared no statistical analyses are conducted and results are reported as trends.

Other analyses include t-tests on differences between pre and post test scores on the Content Examination. Results of the verbal interaction analysis are reported as numbers of responses per category.

2.2 PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

In this section results are presented and discussed separately for each grade level.

2.2.1 Kindergarten

Tables 3 through 8 contain results of the analyses for the Bilingual Kindergarten (B.K.) the Reception Kindergarten (R.K.)

Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices:

Analyses of results on Raven's whether analysed by Program (B.K. versus R.K.) in table 3; by Sex in table 4 or by Sex within Program, table 5, reveal no significant

differences between pairs of means. Because of this, adjustments to scores on other dependent variables are very small.

French Comprehension (OISE)

There is no significant difference between results of B.K. and R.K. for each of the subscores and for total scores on the OISE (see table 3). Because there were three instances of incomplete data (a pupil who was missing either a Raven or OISE score), the N's on which the analyses of covariance are based , are slightly smaller than those for analyses of variance performed on the larger N's. Since the significance levels of the analyses of variance and the corresponding analyses of covariance were so similar, only one type of analysis, that of covariance, has been reproduced in the tables.

Results analysed by sex (table 4) reveal no significant differences on Raven's or the language test. Results analysed by Sex within Program (table 5) reveal a significant difference ($p < .05$) for age (in months) between males ($\bar{X} = 61.14$) and females ($\bar{X} = 67.50$) for B.K. There are no significant between-sex differences on the Raven's nor on any of the OISE subscores for either B.K. or R.K.

The results of the analyses of differences between pretest and posttest means on each of the OISE subscores for the Bilingual Kindergarten are presented in table 6.

There is a significant difference (beyond .05) between pretest and posttest scores for OISE total, OISE 1 and OISE 3.

B.K. posttest results for OISE total ($\bar{X}$ = 31.07, SD = 12.54) are comparable to the Ontario immersion kindergarten norms ($\bar{X}$ = 28.36, SD 8.65).

Verbal Interaction Analyses:

Observations of verbal interactions during the late fall and spring sessions are summarized in tables 7 and 8.

A breakdown of verbal events is contained in table 7. A "verbal event" refers to an utterance whether statement, command, explanation or question through which the child attempts to communicate. Proper names, repetitions and words unspecified as to language are not included in the corpus. These utterances are viewed as "exchanges" in the context of social interactions (table 8). The eight pupils selected for observation had little or no experience with French. Because of illness, the number was reduced to seven.

Level 3 of table 7 designates the breakdown of verbal events by language. English predominates during both sessions with the ratio of 4:1 English to French. Inspection of the table at level 4 reveals that pupil-pupil verbal events in French increase substantially during the second session. Almost fifty percent of the French utterances in

the second session are directed to other pupils as compared to four percent in session one.

The breakdown of verbal exchanges directed toward teacher and pupils is indicated in table 8. Most of the teacher-pupil exchanges are a result of pupil initiated questions.

In previous years, verbal interaction analyses revealed that by the second half of the year, almost all conversations with the teachers were in French, this year this is true for only thirtypercent of such verbal exchanges. Although the teacher spoke French in class and attempted to reformulate English responses and questions in French, pupils during the current year may have been aware of her fluency in English and were less reluctant to speak in English than were pupils in previous years where teachers had a very limited command of the language.

2.2.2 Grade One

The results for the analyses at grade one are presented in tables 9 through 14 and in Appendix F for former pupils of the Bilingual Kindergarten (Former B.K.), of the Reception Kindergarten (Former R.K.) and of the English Kindergarten (Former E.K.). Pupils who entered grade one, St. Joseph, during the current scholastic year are categorized as new pupils and their results presented separately in Appendix F.

Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices:

Results obtained on the Raven's at the Kindergarten level were reanalysed for the pupils participating in the 1981-1982 testing. There were no significant differences between means for former B.K. ($\bar{X}$ = 17.40), former R.K. ($\bar{X}$ = 17.33) and former E.K. ($\bar{X}$ = 18.00) pupils. Consequently results obtained on language tests for analyses of variance are similar to those reported for the analyses of covariance where the Raven's is used as covariate.

Peabody:

As indicated in table 9, the difference between the adjusted mean ($\bar{X}$ = 65.23) for the former B.K. pupils and the adjusted mean ($\bar{X}$ = 61.31) for the former E.K. pupils is not significant.

Metropolitan (Language):

This difference between the adjusted mean for the former E.K. (27.45) and that of the former B.K. (23.40) is just short of significance at the .05 level.

French Comprehension (OISE):

On the OISE total and on each of the OISE subscores, pairs of means are significantly different from each other well beyond .01. This difference is in the expected direction with former R.K. pupils scoring significantly higher than former B.K. pupils who, in turn, score

significantly higher than former E.K. pupils. These results are obtained whether the Raven's (see table 9) or the Metropolitan (see table 10) is used as the covariate.

An examination of unadjusted mean scores on the OISE for the nine new arrivals in Grade One (Appendix F) reveals that these scores are intermediate between the results of the former E.K. and those of the former B.K. Since these are results obtained at the end of grade 1 they could reflect the effect of the Integrated Social Studies Program on this group of pupils.

Oral Language Measure (OLM):

As indicated in table 9 (where means have been adjusted using Raven) and in table 10 (where means have been adjusted using Metropolitan) a difference on each of the first seven parameters is significant well beyond .01. This difference in the expected direction is significant between results for former B.K. pupils and former E.K. pupils and between former R.K. and former E.K. pupils. Although the mean rating is higher for the former R.K. compared to the former B.K. pupils on each of the first six parameters, the difference does not reach significance. The mean on lexical quantity (total number of French words) is higher for the former R.K. ($\bar{X}$ = 121.91) compared to the former B.K. ($\bar{X}$ = 95.93) but the difference is not statistically significant. It is noteworthy that pupils in the former

R.K. did not use English words in responding. The former B.K. mean ($\bar{X}$ = 30.96) for English words was similar to that of the former E.K. ($\bar{X}$ = 38.22). None of the differences between groups are significant.

Examining the results of unadjusted means for the new pupils (Appendix F) one again observes that results are intermediate between those of the former E.K. and those of the former B.K. Unfortunately the N on which these averages are based is only 3.

Content Examination:

The analyses of Social Studies content subscores are presented in table 11. Although the difference on the number of correct answers and in the percent correct is not significant, mean scores are higher for the former French Kindergarten pupils. Between program differences are significant for number of questions posed in English and number of answers given in English.

As seen in table 12, pretest-posttest differences for the former B.K. pupils do not reach significance on any of the subscores.

These results are somewhat disconcerting. One would expect the former B.K. to achieve a higher score than that achieved by the former F.K. and one would predict a significantly higher postest over pretest mean. In attempting to find an explanation for these results protocols were

re-examined in some detail. Since the language of instruction was French, examiners had been instructed to ask all questions, initially, in French. If the pupil responded (correctly or incorrectly) the examiner would go on to the next question. If the examinee did not respond or seemed puzzled examiners repeated the questions in English. Most pupils seemed to prefer providing some response, no matter how inappropriate, to seeking clarification in English. Although an effort was made to phrase questions directly and simply, this procedure seems to confound comprehension of the second language and knowledge of content. It is evident that the examination procedure needs to be revised so that it is content and not language which is tested.

Verbal Interaction Analyses:

Inspection of table 13 reveals the breakdown by session of verbal events in the grade one classroom during the Social Studies period. The number of observations are approximately the same for the two sessions 54:58. Level 3 reveals an increase in the number of communications in English from the first to the second session.

As indicated in table 14, exchanges with teachers and between pupils are close in number 50:62. Most of the pupil to teacher exchanges are the result of reactions to teacher initiated questions.

The decrease in the use of French in the second session is disappointing. It could reflect the change in teacher which occurred over the Christmas break or it could simply be a function of the nature of the session during which the children were observed.

2.2.3 Grade Two

The results for the analyses of results at grade two are found in tables 15 through 22. Comparisons are made between mean scores for former Bilingual Kindergarten (Former B.K.), former English Kindergarten (Former E.K.) and new pupils who entered St. Joseph Elementary School at the beginning of grade one or grade two. Because the former B.K. consisted of pupils who were English dominant or bilingual, results were further broken down (see table 18) so that differences between these two groups could be observed.

The F test of the analysis of variance for Raven's is significant at the .05 level. A significant difference exists between the mean for former B.K. ($\bar{X}$ = 28.89) and that of the former E.K. ($\bar{X}$ = 21.40). There is also a significant difference between the mean for new pupils ($\bar{X}$ = 26.86) and that for the former E.K. pupils. The results of Peabody, Metropolitan and OLM are adjusted on the basis of results on the Raven within each subgroup. (Former B.K., Former E.K., New pupils).

The difference between males ($\bar{X}$ = 27.17) and females ($\bar{X}$ = 25.22) is not significant (Table 17).

Peabody (French):

As indicated in table 15, the difference between former B.K. ($\bar{X}$ = 70.08), former E.K. ($\bar{X}$ = 33.97) and new pupils ($\bar{X}$ = 23.52) is very significant ($p < .0001$). There is no significant sex difference (table 17). When the former B.K. group is divided on language background as English dominant or bilingual (table 18), means on the Peabody are similar, $\bar{X}$ = 72.00 and $\bar{X}$ = 74.00 respectively. It seems, then, that by grade two on vocabulary as measured by the French translation of the Peabody, a group which consists of pupils who are English language dominant do almost as well as those who are fluent in French .

Metropolitan (Language):

The adjusted mean for the former E.K. ($\bar{X}$ = 47.37) is greater than that for the new pupils ($\bar{X}$ = 44.03) and that of former B.K. ($\bar{X}$ = 36.15) but differences do not reach significance. Means for males ($\bar{X}$ = 42.80) and females ($\bar{X}$ = 42.06) are similar. The breakdown by language background reveals that the mean for the English dominant subgroup ($\bar{X}$ = 48.00) is greater but not significantly greater than for the bilingual subgroup ($\bar{X}$ = 42.50).

Oral Language Measure (OLM):

Whether one uses the Raven's (table 15) or the Metropolitan (table 16) as covariate, differences on the first seven parameters of the O.L.M. are significant. Differences are always in the same direction, Former B.K. is greater

than former E.K. and the subgroup of new pupils. There are no sex differences on any of the parameters (table 17).

The breakdown by linguistic background (table 18) reveals that the bilingual subgroup achieves the most impressive results on all parameters but General Comprehension. The English dominant subgroup achieves higher means than does the former E.K. group.

Content Examination:

The results of the analysis of the Social Studies content examination are presented in table 20. Ideally these results should be compared to a French speaking grade two sample. Comparisons are made between Former B.K. and the new pupils at grade two. Whether Raven's or Metropolitan is used as covariate, differences are significant only for the number of English questions and the number of English answers. The new pupils seek translations of questions and volunteer more English answers than do pupils in the former B.K. subgroup.

Verbal Interaction Analysis:

In grade two the one observation session was conducted in the spring.

Inspection of table 21 reveals that although English dominant pupils were responsible for the greater number of verbal events, the ratio of French to English is 3:2 as compared to the 3:1 ratio for bilingual pupils. With the exception of 3 utterances made by the English dominant group, all pupil-pupil verbal events are in English.

The didactic nature of the Social Studies class is reflected in the large number of teacher-pupil exchanges relative to pupil-pupil exchanges (table 22). Most of these exchanges are the result of responses to teacher initiated questions. It is encouraging to note that for English dominant pupils questions are more frequently initiated in French than in English (9:4) level 5.

3. EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

The following sections deal with the evaluation of the Bilingual Kindergarten Program and the Integrated Social Studies Programs followed in grades one and two.

3.1 The Bilingual Kindergarten Program

A revised version[11] of the Bilingual Kindergarten Program and of the modules[12] through which the program was implemented was followed during the 1981-1982 scholastic year. These revisions incorporated some of the suggestions made by the teacher who used the program and modules and by two outside evaluators, one a program consultant from the Ministry of Education and the other a language specialist from Renée Descartes University, Paris V. These suggestions have been outlined in the 1980-1981 progress report.

3.1.1 Questionnaires

Teacher Questionnaire:

In the current year, as in the previous years, a questionnaire (Appendix H) was forwarded to the teacher of the French component at the kindergarten level seeking comments regarding various aspects of the program such as objectives, guidelines, materials and modules.

Parent Questionnaire

This questionnaire (Appendix I) was distributed to parents for the purpose of obtaining feedback on the program and on its implementation.

3.1.2 Presentation and Discussion of Results

Teacher Questionnaire:

Rather than completing it in writing and because she was the only respondent consulted at this level, the kindergarten teacher chose to express her opinion verbally, during informal meetings. Her comments can be summarized under five headings:

- Program objectives: In general, she finds the notional objectives too specific and limiting. The themes on the Christmas Season and the Animals generated much interest in the students and proved to be the easiest to teach and learn. On the contrary, the two dealing with Traveling and Clothing involve concepts which were difficult to get across. As presently formulated, the one based on Food and Health would require the longest teaching time, whereas the one on Plants and Environment has necessitated more preparation than any other. Moreover, having been trained as a French specialist normally dealing with language programs, she would prefer to be provided with more clearly defined linguistic objectives, formulated in linguistic terms (vocabulary, structures) and language functions and situations.

- Teaching Directions: While admitting that this section of the program mentions flexibility and adaptation, the respondent considers the proposed progression too directive, particularly in the suggested near-monthly distribution of the themes. For instance, she would advocate introducing other themes during the first four months. On the other hand, she indicates that more precise procedures in the use of the modules would be helpful.

- Modules: She is of the opinion that these could be improved in presentation and content. A more uniform format would facilitate their use. She suggests that more importance be given to the teaching of some general notions such as shape and color. In addition, she thinks the activities proposed in each module could be better articulated from one module to another so as to ensure continuity and progression. Finally she recommends that each module be completed with a well-planned series of linguistic exercises such as exercises on adjectives (synonyms and antonyms), on verbs (morphology and syntax), etcetera.

- Supplementary Teaching Materials: The teacher thinks that existing supplies were useful and relevant but that the availability of more games such as Loto, Jigsaw Puzzles, etc., would facilitate individual and group learning activities.

- Students' Progress: She states that the skill in which improvement is most evident for most students is

comprehension. From the point of view of global proficiency in French, she categorized her class as follows: five very good, eight average and three weak.

She acknowledges that her statements and suggestions must be interpreted in the light of a beginning teacher's perspective. In a final comment, she concludes that the program is promising and that her attempt at implementing it has proved to be a rich learning opportunity and a source of satisfaction.

Parent Questionnaire:

Nine of the fifteen questionnaires distributed through the mail to parents were returned. Results of the tabulation appear in table 23.

Interpreting global figures for the four categories in question 1 can be misleading. One must consider the pattern of responses within each questionnaire in order to arrive at some conclusion regarding parental preference. Based on response patterns two respondents want a bilingual program, two want a French program (whether full or half day) within an English school three want English only or half English, half French and two respondents answered yes to all options leading to the assumption that it was choice of school rather than type of program that was the determining factor. This pattern is similar to the one obtained last year.

With regard to questions 2 and 3, the majority of parents (6 of 9) indicated that their children benefited from and enjoyed the French component very much. The balance responded that the program was moderately beneficial and enjoyable. Eight of the nine respondents preferred a program as structured as the one offered. Two believed that their children had learned more French than they expected and five respondents considered that their children had learned about the same amount of French as expected. Six of the respondents indicated that their children had manifested understanding of French on a number of occasions and five indicated that their children spoke French outside of class on a few occasions. Eight would recommend the program to others, one neglected to respond to this question.

All but one respondent made some statement in response to the open-ended questions. Some mentioned the appropriateness of the field trips and outdoor activities. One believed that the program should be more structured with frequent relaying of information about objectives and activities to parents. Most made very positive remarks about the teacher's attitude and committment to her pupils.

3.2 The Integrated Social Studies Programs

- Grade One

The general and intermediate content objectives of the program are contained in a separate document.[13] These

objectives are in line with objectives articulated by the Ministry in regard to its new Social Studies Curriculum.[14] However because of the limitation in French proficiency generally experienced by non-francophone students who have had only half a day of French at the kindergarten level, the official intermediate objectives had to be simplified. In addition, the program includes linguistic indications under the form of basic terminology and structures relating to the field of social studies.

It had been planned that with the help of the notes and comments recorded by the teacher during 1980-1981, modules would be prepared to supplement the program. But considering the perceived merits of Jean-Luc Picard's series entitled Eveil à la réalité (Developing Awareness of Reality) - the second book of which seems to meet the needs of second graders - it was decided at the beginning of 1981-1982 to introduce in grade one the first book of this series, Autour de moi, (Around Me), mainly for reasons of continuity. But as this book deals with most of the themes mentioned in the Integrated Program, the elaboration of modules for this level appeared less pressing, particularly regarding the notional content.

The series Eveil à la réalité was developed with a view to articulate adequately the teaching of social studies in the first cycle of the elementary school. It is based on the specific perspective advocated in the new official

Social Studies curriculum, namely, the exploration of the concepts of time, space and society through the observation of existing phenomena surrounding the child. It consists of three sets of materials respectively for the six, seven and eight-years old. Each set comprises a pedagogical guide and a pupil's workbook. The guide is very detailed in providing theoretical considerations as well as teaching procedures for each of the selected themes. The workbook is also incorporated in the guide. It is introduced by a message to the parents and it is made up of a number of blank pages (to be used for drawing, pictures, etc.), of games and a few exercises requiring a little reading and writing, as the series is normally designed for students attending French language schools. This pupil's book may be used in directed and free activities, for group as well as individual work.

Grade Two:

The integrated program for this level is currently being prepared. Concerning the content, the formulation of the terminal and intermediate objectives, and the presentation of the pedagogical guidelines follow about the same pattern as found in the grade one program. The linguistic part still gives rise to problems and dilemmas. Until now the second grade group has shown very little homogeneity in French proficiency. Besides, the new comers who have not

taken the Bilingual Kindergarten program seem to be sufficiently numerous so as to influence the teaching approach and the attainment of the program objectives. The integrated program differs from both the immersion and regular French as a second language program, not only in intensity but also in its pedagogical approach. On the one hand, in this program French is not only the medium of instruction but is also the object of functional instruction. On the other hand, the selection and progression of forms, functions and skills should emerge naturally from the communication needs deriving from the teaching of a field of knowledge, namely that of Social Studies. As the form of the verbal exchanges associated with lessons in Social Studies may vary with pupils' linguistic characteristics, teacher's teaching style and the nature of dominant learning activities, it seems difficult at this experimental stage to prescribe a priori linguistic objectives that would allow the flexibility still needed in grade two. Nevertheless, plans are made for outlining, in 1982-83 on a tentative basis, sets of language objectives based on contributions from teachers and consultants.

It is worth noting that the lack of explicit language objectives has not precluded the evaluation of French proficiency in grade two in 1981-1982. As already reported in appropriate sections, the use of the French version of the Peabody Picture

Vocabulary Test, the Oral Language Measure and the analysis of verbal interaction has permitted global assessment of the level of lexical comprehension and the quality of expression and spontaneous communication attained by the 1981-1982 second graders.

3.2.1 Teacher Questionnaires

The teacher of the Integrated Social Studies program was asked to complete two questionnaires (Appendices J and K) one for each grade in which the program was followed.

Because the Social Studies component was less obvious to parents than was the French component of the Bilingual Kindergarten comments as regards its implementation or impact were not solicited from parents of children in grades one and two.

3.2.2 Presentation and Discussion of Results

As the respondent was assigned the teaching of the integrated program only after Christmas, she felt she could not fill in all the questions and so limited herself to global comments on selected sections of the two questionnaires.

- Grade One:

In the general formulation of the program, the teacher would like to see explicit language objectives enumerated for each of the proposed content themes. All problems encountered in the application of the program are associated with the

pupils' limited proficiency in French. Since the teaching materials being used call for the learners to express and share the results of their "exploration of reality," she suggests the preparation of supplementary materials such as modules, specifically oriented towards the realisation of the terminal linguistic objectives and providing a large variety of exercises and questions that could facilitate the passage from one lesson to the next.

Referring to the content, the teacher notes that the Jean-Luc Picard series has the double merit of covering about the same subject matter as that prescribed by the Integrated Program and by the official Social Studies curriculum. Concerning the level of difficulty she is of the opinion that the students were already familiar with the concepts associated with the themes of class and school but did not control the related French terminology. However they seem to have broadened their understanding of the notions of space and time during 1981-1982.

Finally, with a view to stimulating the pupils' interest, she suggests that periodic information letters be sent to the parents to keep them posted as to what is going on in class and to ensure their more active cooperation.

- Grade Two:

Because the final version of the grade two Integrated Program is not yet completed, the respondent limited her

comments to the teaching material used, that is Moi et les miens which is the second set of the Eveil à la réalité series. She finds the themes therein well selected and presented. Again she alludes to the language difficulty encountered by a good number of pupils and recommends that modules be developed with a substantial linguistic component. Among a number of exercises and activities, she singles out dialogues through puppets and the individual illustration of themes as being most profitable. The use of music, games, plastic arts and dramatics are also helpful in providing variety, on condition that adequate supplementary materials be available.

When asked to assess globally, on a five-point scale the French progress she has witnessed in her students, she attributes 3 to grammar, 4 to vocabulary and fluency, 5 to pronunciation, expression and comprehension.

As a final practical suggestion, she proposes the acquisition by the school of a series of French books containing simple stories that could serve as background material for the various topics contained in the program.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

As in previous years, this third evaluation deviates from the original design particularly with respect to the testing calendar, the number of groups compared and the number of tests administered. Nevertheless, it may be stated that the evaluation of the pupils, progress and that of the program were fruitful. Content and language tests were administered at three levels corresponding to each of the three cohorts which constitute the subjects of the current longitudinal study. Appropriate comparisons between and within groups were conducted according to recognized statistical procedures with a view to determining students' learning associated with the implementation of the program and to highlight any features of this association. In addition, parents, teachers, administrators and specialists were consulted, in writing or personally, on their perception of the program and on possible changes leading to its improvement.

Based on analyses of scores obtained on the Raven's, Metropolitan and Peabody Picture Vocabulary, the differences between groups at each of the three levels, kindegarten, grade one and grade two, did not reach statistical significance at .01. With respect to these tests, comparison groups at each level are considered equivalent.

Content results are reported only for grades one and two. Analysis reveals that by the end of spring, first graders taking the Integrated Social Studies program attain about the same level of knowledge as the pupils attending the French school. No matter how difficult it may be to account for the rather surprising fall results, it remains that 77% must be considered realistic and satisfactory as an end-of-year result for a group of pupils who receive their Social Studies instruction in a language other than their own. In second grade, the nine pupils who had attended the Bilingual Kindergarten achieved somewhat better than did the five new pupils. In addition, among the original nine, the five English-dominant pupils were superior to their four bilingual classmates. These differences, however, are based on small numbers and do not reach statistical significance.

Although the assessment of progress in English language skills was not extensive, it remains useful within the frameworks of a longitudinal study. To this end the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (Language) and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test were administered. The Metropolitan served a double purpose. Used as a covariate, it takes into account proficiency in one's dominant language in the analysis of results in second language. As an English language measure focusing on comprehension, punctuation, capitalization, language usage, syntax, and spelling, it

demonstrates that, on these linguistic features, the former Bilingual Kindergarten pupils are somewhat inferior to those taking the regular English program. On the other hand, from the point of view of vocabulary growth as measured by the Peabody administered in English at grade one, the former Bilingual Kindergarten pupils are superior to their regular English program peers but the difference does not reach statistical significance.

Assessment of progress in French is based on the results of five different measures applied differentially to each school level: The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (French version), the OISE French Comprehension Test (Primes and Level One), the Oral Language Measure, the Verbal Interaction and the frequencies of English utterances during French interviews. At the end of the school year, the Bilingual Kindergarten pupils seem to understand spoken French almost as well as students in the Reception class, whether there is question of vocabulary, sentences or short stories. Girls seem to be superior to boys on that skill but differences are non significant. These results demonstrate that a half-time French program may be associated with a level of comprehension nearly equivalent to that of students attending a full day French instruction program. When compared to published norms of Ontario students taking an immersion kindergarten program, the Bilingual Kindergarten students

appear to be slightly superior. In addition, significant pretest-posttest differences on all skills with the exception of comprehension of structure reveal substantial gains during the year. Finally, at the end of the year, they seem more inclined to express themselves in French with their peers as revealed in the verbal interaction analysis.

In grade one, the assessment of progress in French is based on the analysis of results obtained through the OISE French Comprehension Test (Level One), the Oral Language Measure, the verbal interaction analysis and the use of English during interviews. At the end of the year, the former Bilingual Kindergarten pupils understand French less well than their counterparts in the former Reception program, but much better than those taking the regular English program. This is true of vocabulary, structures and short stories. On the other hand during an interview where they describe a series of pictures, their comprehension, the lexical, grammatical, discussive and enunciative quality of their utterances are similar to those of the former Reception students and far superior to those manifested by the former Regular English students. The analysis of verbal interactions reveals little change in patterns of communication. At the end of the year, as at the beginning, the pupils speak English with classmates and French with the teacher. These exchanges with the teacher are primarily in the form of

responses to questions related to the discipline of Social Studies. In regard to dependency on English, verbal behavior during individually administered tests revealed that the former Bilingual Kindergarten pupils understood the majority (about 95%) of the French questions and that most of their answers (about 80%) were in French. It is worth noting that the new pupils in grade one rely much more on English than their classmates but much less than the students taking the Regular English program.

In grade two, the progress in French made by the former Bilingual Kindergarten students is assessed through the French version of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, the Oral Language Measure, the verbal interaction analysis and the frequency of English utterances during the French interviews. The former Bilingual Kindergarten pupils are compared with a group of new pupils and the students in the Regular English program. Within-group comparisons are made between bilingual and English-dominant students, and also between boys and girls. In lexical comprehension, the former Bilingual Kindergarten students, whether they are considered as bilingual or English-dominant, girls or boys are superior to the new pupils and to pupils from the regular English program. With respect to semi directed expression, the former Bilingual Kindergarten maintains its superiority although the bilingual subgroup is ahead of the

English-dominant subgroup. The bilinguals are also those who more frequently respond in French when addressed by the teacher.

In summary, pupil progress in content knowledge, in English and in French provides evidence that the three cohorts that went through the Bilingual Kindergarten program have profited from this supplementary experience. They have acquired some general notions and knowledge in Social Studies while learning as much English and substantially more French than the pupils following the regular English program. As anticipated, they know less French than the non-francophones who take the full-day Reception kindergarten program and receive all their instruction in French in subsequent grades.

From the point of view of parents and teachers, the program is considered advantageous. Nearly all the parents would recommend it to other parents on the basis of positive feedback from their own children. The teachers participating in the program implementation clearly identify some deficiencies but their criticism is constructive. They believe the program to be viable and deserving of improvements particularly with respect to the clarification of linguistic objectives, the availability of materials and contacts with parents.

Within the context of the original plan, the implementation of the program and its effects, to date, could be

considered as a qualified success. An uncertain budget has made the hiring of a teacher, a yearly, last-minute arrangement. The succession of four kindergarten teachers with different academic backgrounds and teaching experiences has made it difficult to establish continuity in program development and evaluation. In addition, the language heterogeneity of each of the experimental groups at the kindergarten level and the inclusion of new pupils at each level beyond have necessitated the formation of small subgroups, limiting the generalizability of results, and making it impossible to draw conclusions about the type of pupils for whom such a program is an advantage.

The 1982-1983 scholastic year promises to be one in which, for the first time, some continuity of instruction will be established at the kindergarten and upper levels. The proposed short-term evaluation plan (three cohorts, kindergarten to grade three) will continue to be implemented. Cohort one will be evaluated at grade three, cohort two at grade two and cohort three at grade one. Because of the more stable situation foreseen for the coming year, it is hoped that, on a one-year basis, some limited testing of the development of French syntax and communication can be conducted within the Bilingual Kindergarten.

NOTES

1. Buteau, M. and Gougeon, H., First Progress Report: Evaluation of the St. Joseph of Mount Royal Bilingual Kindergarten Program, 1979-80. Report submitted to the St. Croix School Commission, August, 1980.

2. Buteau, M. and Gougeon, H., Second Progress Report: Evaluation of the Bilingual Kindergarten Program, St. Joseph Elementary School, Town of Mount Royal. Report submitted to the St. Croix School Commission, August, 1981.

3. We wish to thank the executive and members of the St. Joseph School Committee as well as the administrators, principals, teachers ans parents for their interest and support in the implementation and evaluation of the programs. A special note of thanks to the pupils who cooperated in the testing program.

4. Raven, J.C. Coloured Progresive Matrices. London, H.K. Lewis, 1962.

5. Dunn, Lloyd M. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, Minn: American Guidance Services, Inc., 1959.

6. The French version was administered to Grade two pupils. It was previously administered in 1979-1980 and revised in 1980-1981 by one of the authors of this report.

7. Barik, Henri C. French Comprehension Test, Primer. Toronto: OISE, 1977.

8. _____. French Comprehension Test, Level One. Toronto: OISE, 1977.

9. Prescott, G.A. et al. Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Language, Form vs Primary 1 and Primary 2. N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace Javanovich Inc., 1978.

10. Picard, Jean-Luc. Moi et les miens. Guide pédagogique et Carnet d'observation. Collection: Eveil à la réalité. Montréal: Centre éducatif et culturel Inc., 1978.

11. Partie française du programme de Maternelle bilingue. St. Joseph of Mount Royal Elementary School, préparée pour La Commission Scolaire Sainte-Croix, for M.F. Buteau et H. Gougeon, 1980.

12. Ten sets of materials and pedagogical activities based on the major themes or topics through which the objectives of the program are realized.

13. Programme expérimental d'enseignement intégré des sciences humaines et du français langue seconde en première année, préparé pour la Commission scolaire Sainte-Croix par M.F. Buteau et H. Rougeon, 1980.

14. Ministère de l'Education, Direction des programmes. Programme d'études. Primaire, Sciences Humaines. Québec: Gouvernement du Québec, 1981.

TABLE 1

PROPOSED TESTING SCHEDULE 1981-1982

Group:	Bilingual/ Follow-up	Reception/ Post Reception	English	French
TESTS:				
KINDERGARTEN				
BSM (eng.)	Fall	Fall	Fall	
BSM (Fr.)	Spring	Spring		
CONTENT	Fall/Sp.			
FRENCH COMPREHENSION	Fall/Sp.	Fall/Sp.	Spring	
PEABODY (ENG.)	Spring	Spring	Spring	
PEABODY (Fr.)	Spring	Spring		
RAVEN	Fall	Fall	Fall	
VERBAL INTERACTION	Fall/Sp.			
GRADE ONE				Fall/Sp.
CONTENT	Fall/Sp.			
FRENCH COMPREHENSION	Spring	Spring	Spring	
METROPOLITAN (Lang.)	Spring	Spring	Spring	
O.L.M. (Fr.)	Spring	Spring	Spring	
PEOBODY (Eng.)	Spring		Spring	
VERBAL INTERACTION	Fall/Sp.			
GRADE TWO				Spring
CONTENT	Spring		Spring	
METROPOLITAN (Lang.)	Spring		Spring	Spring
O.L.M. (Fr.)	Spring		Spring	Spring
PEABODY (Fr.)	Spring		Fall	Fall
RAVEN	Fall			
VERBAL INTERACTION	Fall/Sp.			

TABLE 2

ACTUAL TESTING SCHEDULE 1981-1982

GROUP:	BILINGUAL/ FOLLOW UP	RECEPTION/ POST-RECEPTION	ENGLISH	FRENCH
TESTS:				
KINDERGARTEN				
FRENCH COMPREHENSION	Fall/Sp.	Spring		
RAVEN	Fall	Fall		
VERBAL INTERACTION	Fall/Sp.			
GRADE ONE				
CONTENT	Fall/Sp.			Spring
FRENCH COMPREHENSION	Spring	Spring	Spring	
METROPOLITAN (Lang.)	Spring	Spring	Spring	
O.L.M. (Fr.)	Spring	Spring	Spring	
PEABODY (Eng.)	Spring		Spring	
VERBAL INTERACTION	Fall/Sp.			
GRADE TWO				
CONTENT	Spring			
METROPOLITAN	Spring		Spring	
O.L.M. (Fr.)	Spring		Spring	
PEABODY (Fr.)	Spring		Spring	
RAVEN	Fall		Fall	
VERBAL INTERACTION	Fall			

TABLE 3

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON STANDARDIZED LANGUAGE TESTS FOR COHORT 3 AT THE KINDERGARTEN LEVEL

GROUPS	B.K.				R.K.				
VARIABLES	(N)	UNADJ $\bar{X}$	(SD)	ADJ. $\bar{X}$	(N)	UNADJ $\bar{X}$	(SD)	ADJ $\bar{X}$	Sig. Level
RAVEN (Covariate)	(13)	18.23	(4.27)		(9)	17.55	(3.36)		.6960
	(11)*	17.70			(8)*	18.00			
OISE TOTAL (45 Max.)	(11)*	34.43		34.48	(8)*	40.52		40.47	.1910
OISE 1 (25 Max.)		20.09		20.11		22.63		22.60	.3178
OISE 2 (10 Max.)		7.36		7.37		9.00		8.99	.1556
OISE 3 (10 Max.)		6.98		7.00		8.90		8.88	.1007

* Data complete for RAVEN and OISE

TABLE 4

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON STANDARDIZED LANGUAGE TESTS FOR COHORT 3 AT THE KINDERGARTEN LEVEL BY SEX

GROUPS	BILINGUAL KINDERGARTEN + RECEPTION KINDERGARTEN						
	MALES			FEMALES			
VARIABLES	(N)	UNADJ $\bar{X}$	ADJ $\bar{X}$	(N)	UNADJ $\bar{X}$	ADJ $\bar{X}$	Sig. Level
RAVEN	(11)	18.27		(11)	17.64		.7081
	(9)	17.67		(10)	18.00		
OISE TOTAL	(9)*	33.97	34.03	(10)*	39.70	39.69	.2141
OISE 1		19.56	19.59		22.60	22.57	.2212
OISE 2		7.67	7.67		8.40	8.39	.5354
OISE 3		6.75	6.78		8.72	8.70	.0863

* Data complete for RAVEN'S and OISE.

TABLE 5

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON STANDARDIZED LANGUAGE TESTS FOR COHORT 3 AT THE KINDERGARTEN LEVEL BY SEX WITHIN PROGRAM

GROUPS	B.K.									R.K.								
	Males				Females					Males				Females				
VARIABLES	(N)	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	(SD)	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	(N)	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	(SD)	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	Sig. Lev.	(N)	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	(SD)	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	(N)	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	(SD)	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	Sig. Lev.
AGE		61.14	(2.19)			67.50	(5.21)		.013									
RAVEN*	(7)	19.57	(5.35)		(6)	16.66	(1.97)		.236	(4)	16.00	(2.83)		(5)	18.80	(3.49)		.237
OISE TOTAL	(5)	31.86		31.60	(6)	36.62		36.83	.557	(4)	37.00		38.54	(4)	44.00		42.45	.076
OISE 1		18.60		18.51		21.33		21.41	.516		20.75		21.84		24.50		23.41	.300
OISE 2		7.26		7.20		7.45		7.50	.921		8.25		8.57		9.75		9.43	.448
OISE 3		6.09		5.80		7.76		8.00	.374		8.00		8.14		9.75		9.61	.076

* Adjustment with RAVEN'S may vary slightly with each analyses because of a few instances of incomplete data.

TABLE 6

RESULTS OF t - TESTS BETWEEN PRETEST - POSTTEST DIFFERENCES ON OISE FOR THE BILINGUAL KINDERGARTEN

	PRETEST (N=12)		POSTTEST (N=12)			
	$\bar{X}$	(SD)	$\bar{X}$	(SD)	t	Pr > t
OISE TOTAL	27.75	(12.14)	31.07	(12.54)	2.90	.016
OISE 1	15.50	(7.24)	18.20	(7.24	2.77	.019
OISE 2	6.67	(2.84)	6.60	(2.95)	1.17	.269
OISE 3	5.58	(2.64)	6.27	(2.87)	2.23	.049

TABLE 7

BREAKDOWN OF PUPIL VERBAL EVENTS IN THE BILINGUAL KINDERGARTEN BY SESSION (FALL, SPRING) BY LANGUAGE SPOKEN DURING CLASS (ENGLISH, FRENCH) AND BY PERSONAL REFERENCE (TEACHER, PUPIL)

LEVEL								
1	VERBAL EVENTS							
	251							
2	SESSION 1				SESSION 2			
	139				112			
3	In English		In French		In English		In French	
	113		26		90		22	
4	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P
	36	77	25	1	23	67	12	10

TABLE 8

BREAKDOWN OF PUPIL VERBAL EXCHANGES IN THE BILINGUAL KINDERGARTEN BY SESSION (FALL, SPRING) WITH TEACHERS AND WITH PUPILS BY TYPE OF VERBAL INTERACTION (RESPONDING (R) OR INITIATING I CONVERSATION)

LEVEL								
1	EXCHANGES							
	251							
2	WITH TEACHERS				WITH PUPILS			
	96				155			
3	R		I		R		I	
	37		59		46		109	
4	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2
	24	13	37	22	19	27	59	50

TABLE 9

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE (RAVEN-COVARIATE) ON LANGUAGE TESTS FOR COHORT 2 AT GRADE ONE

GROUPS	FORMER B.K.			FORMER R.K.			FORMER E.K.			
VARIABLES	(N)	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	(N)	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	(N)	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	Sig. Level
RAVEN (CO-VAR.)	(15)	17.40		(6)	17.33		(11)	18.00		.8628
PEABODY ENG.	(11)	64.91	65.23				(11)	61.64	61.31	.1846
METROPOLITAN (40 MAX.)	(14)	23.21	23.40				(10)	27.70	27.45	.0513
OISE TOTAL	(14)*	23.21	23.27	(6)*	38.00	38.12	(11)*	7.36	7.22	.0001**
OISE 1		11.86	11.88		18.67	18.72		3.18	3.12	.0001**
OISE 2		4.21	4.22		7.33	7.36		1.09	1.06	.0001**
OISE 3		7.14	7.16		12.00	12.04		3.09	3.05	.0001**
OLM (FR.)										
-Gen. Comp. (0-5)	(15)*	3.80	3.80	(5)*	4.39	4.40	(10)*	1.30	1.30	.0001***
-Lexical Q. (0-5)		2.40	2.42		2.80	2.80		.60	.59	.0011***
-Gramm. Q. (0-5)		2.12	2.13		2.60	2.62		.31	.30	.0027***
-Discur. Q. (0-5)		2.33	2.32		3.00	3.01		.21	.20	.0005***
-Enunc. Q. (0-5)		2.00	2.00		3.40	3.40		.20	.20	.0021***
-Pers. Exp. (0-3)		.80	.80		1.00	1.01		.11	.10	.0007***
-Lexical Quantity		95.73	95.93		121.80	121.91		15.67	15.60	.0005***
-Eng. Wds.		29.80	30.96		0.00	0.00		39.20	38.22	.3222

* Data complete for Raven's and language test

** Difference significant for: Former B.K. vs Former E.K.; Former R.K. vs Former E.K.; Former B.K. vs Former R.K.

*** Difference significant for: Former B.K. vs Former E.K.; Former R.K. vs Former E.K.

TABLE 10

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE (METROPOLITAN - COVARIATE) ON LANGUAGE TESTS FOR COHORT 2 AT GRADE ONE

TOTAL GROUPS

GROUPS	FORMER B.K. (15)			FORMER E.K. (11)			
	(N)	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	(N)	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	Sig. Level
VARIABLES							
METROP. (COVAR.)	(14)	23.21		(10)	27.70		.0525
OISE TOTAL	(13)*	23.08	23.61	(10)*	7.10	6.41	.0002
OISE 1		12.08	12.31		3.30	2.99	.0002
OISE 2		4.15	4.23		1.00	.90	.0023
OISE 3		6.85	7.07		2.80	2.51	.0007
OLM - FR.							
-Gen. Comp. (0-5)	(14)*	3.71	3.81	(9)*	1.11	.96	.0001
-Lexical Q. (0-5)		2.29	2.36		.44	.32	.0006
-Gramm. Q. (0-5)		2.00	2.04		.11	.05	.0012
-Discur. Q. (0-5)		2.21	2.26		.11	.04	.0006
-Enunc. Q. (0-5)		1.79	1.86		.00	-.12	.0024
-Pers. Exp. (0-3)		.79	.79		.11	.10	.0013
-Lexical Quantity		95.08	98.86		12.11	9.33	.0016
-Eng. Wds.		31.93	35.59		43.56	37.86	.9273

* Complete data for Metropolitan and language test.

TABLE 11

ANALYSES OF COVARIANCE ON CONTENT SUBSCORES FOR COHORT 2 AT GRADE ONE

GROUPS:	FORMER B.K. (15)			FORMER F.K. (12)			
	(N)	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	(N)	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	Sig. Level
VARIABLES							
RAVEN	(15)	17.40		(12)	16.75		
CONTENT							
NO. OF CORR. ANS. (Max.)		68.53	68.41		72.67	72.99	n.s.
PERCENT CORRECT		77.07	76.83		81.58	81.98	n.s.
NO. ENG. QUES.		4.80	4.80		.25	.25	.01
NO. ENG. ANS.		20.33	20.01		.33	.33	.01
NO. UNANS. QUES.		.60	.60		.00	.00	n.s.

TABLE 12

RESULTS OF t TESTS BETWEEN PRETEST - POSTTEST DIFFERENCES ON CONTENT SUBSCORES FOR COHORT 2 AT GRADE ONE

FORMER B.K. (15)

	PRETEST		POSTTEST			
CONTENT	MEAN	SD	MEAN	SD	t	Pr > t
NO. OF CORR. ANS. (89 Max.)	66.07	8.27	68.53	9.18	1.22	.241
PERCENT CORRECT	74.13	9.26	77.07	10.33	1.28	.222
NO. ENG. QUES.	4.80	6.93	4.80	7.13	0.00	1.000
NO. ENG. ANS.	18.53	14.89	20.33	17.76	.54	.598
NO. UNANS. QUES.	.87	1.60	.60	.99	-.55	.589

TABLE 13

BREAKDOWN OF PUPIL VERBAL EVENTS IN GRADE ONE BY SESSION (FALL, SPRING), BY LANGUAGE SPOKEN DURING CLASS (ENGLISH, FRENCH) AND BY PERSONAL REFERENCE (TEACHER, PUPIL)

LEVEL								
1	VERBAL EVENTS							
	112							
2	SESSION 1				SESSION 2			
	54				58			
3	In English		In French		In English		In French	
	25		29		40		18	
4	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P
	6	19	20	9	8	32	16	2

TABLE 14

BREAKDOWN OF PUPIL VERBAL EXCHANGES IN GRADE ONE WITH TEACHER AND PUPILS BY TYPE OF VERBAL INTERACTION (RESPONDING (R), INITIATING (I) CONVERSATION) AND BY SESSION (FALL, SPRING)

LEVEL

1

EXCHANGES

112

2

WITH TEACHER				WITH PUPILS			
50				62			
3	R		I		R		I
	33		17		22		40
4	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2
	18	15	8	9	9	13	19	21

TABLE 15

ANALYSES OF COVARIANCE (RAVEN COVARIATE) ON LANGUAGE TESTS FOR COHORT I AT GRADE TWO

GROUPS	FORMER B.K.				NEW PUPILS				FORMER E.K.				
VARIABLES	(N)	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	(SD)	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	(N)	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	(SD)	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	(N)	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	(SD)	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	Sig. Level
RAVEN	(9)	28.89	(4.65)		(7)	26.86	(3.93)		(10)	21.40	(6.17)		.0121
PEABODY (FR.)	(9)	72.67	(11.11)	70.08	(7)	24.57	(20.80)	23.52	(10)	30.90	(15.79)	33.97	.0001**
METROPOLITAN (55 MAX.)	(8)	39.75	(16.12)	36.15	(5)	46.40	(5.18)	44.03	(10)	43.30	(7.48)	47.37	.1844
OLM (FR.)													
-Gen. Comp. (0-5)	(9)*	4.89		4.80	(7)*	1.71		1.68	(10)*	2.50		2.60	.0015**
-Lexical Q. (0-5)		3.49		3.44		.43		.44		1.14		1.20	.0001**
-Gramm. Q. (0-5)		3.36		3.33		.57		.58		.96		1.00	.0001**
-Discur. Q. (0-5)		3.64		3.56		.43		.46		.59		.70	.0001**
-Enunc. Q. (0-5)		3.57		3.44		.43		.48		.65		.80	.0001**
-Pers. Exp. (0-3)		1.91		1.89		.14		.15		.17		.20	.0001**
-Lexical Quantity		132.67		129.56		17.02		18.29		40.80		44.49	.0001**
-Eng. Wds.		25.56		28.99		50.43		51.83		14.88		10.73	.2325

* Complete data for RAVEN and OLM

** Difference significant for: Former B.K. vs New Pupils; Former B.K. vs Former E.K.

TABLE 16

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE (METROPOLITAN COVARIATE) ON LANGUAGE TESTS FOR COHORT 1 AT GRADE TWO

GROUPS	FORMER B.K. (8)*		NEW PUPILS (5)*		FORMER E.K. (10)*		
VARIABLES	UNADM.$\bar{X}$	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	Sig. Level
METROPOLITAN (COV.)	39.75		46.40		43.30		.1844
PEABODY (FR.)	70.25	70.67	28.80	29.02	30.90	30.93	.0001
OLM (FR.)							
-Gen. Comp. (0-5)	4.76	4.88	2.14	2.00	2.50	2.52	.0074**
-Lexical Q. (0-5)	3.40	3.50	.72	.60	1.20	1.22	.0001**
-Gramm. Q. (0-5)	3.23	3.25	.82	.80	1.00	1.00	.0001**
-Discur Q. (0-5)	3.50	3.49	.61	.60	.70	.70	.0001**
-Enunc. Qu. (0-5)	3.33	3.38	.65	.60	.80	.81	.0003**
-Pers. Exp. (0-3)	1.83	1.88	.25	.20	.20	.21	.0001**
-Lexical Quantity	129.13	130.12	23.60	22.38	40.80	40.61	.0002**
-Eng. Wds.	28.75	20.72	51.60	61.43	14.80	16.31	.0830

* Complete data for all tests
** Difference significant for: Former B.K. vs New Pupils; Former B.K. vs Former E.K.

TABLE 17

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE (RAVEN COVARIATE) ON LANGUAGE TESTS FOR COHORT 1 AT GRADE TWO BY SEX

GROUPS:	FORMER B.K. + NEW PUPILS + FORMER E.K. (N=24)				
	MALES (6)		FEMALES (18)		
VARIABLES	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	Sig. Level
RAVEN	27.17		25.22		
PEABODY	47.50	44.93	45.33	46.19	.9173
METROPOLITAN (55 MAX.)	42.80	41.70	42.06	42.41	.9053
OLM (FR.)					
-Gen. Comp. (0-5)	4.33	4.23	2.83	2.87	.1517
-Lexical Q. (0-5)	2.17	2.09	1.72	1.75	.6449
-Gramm. Q. (0-5)	2.17	2.08	1.61	1.64	.5523
-Discur. Q. (0-5)	1.83	1.72	1.61	1.65	.9275
-Enunc. Qu. (0-5)	1.50	1.41	1.78	1.81	.6411
-Pers. Exp. (0-3)	.83	.76	.83	.86	.8319
-Lexical Quantity	76.67	71.76	66.89	68.53	.9156
-Eng. Wds.	13.00	12.50	29.94	30.11	.4160

TABLE 18

OBTAINED MEANS ON LANGUAGE TESTS AND CONTENT EXAMINATION (POSTTEST) FOR PUPILS AT GRADE TWO (ST. JOSEPH) DESIGNATED AS ENGLISH DOMINANT OR BILINGUAL

	FORMER B.K. (9)		FORMER E.K. (10)
GROUPS	ENG. DOMINANT (5)	BILINGUALS (4)	
RAVEN	28.00	30.00	21.40
PEABODY (FR.)	72.00	74.00	30.90
METROPOLITAN	48.00	42.50	43.30
OLM (FR.)			
-Gen. Comp. (0-5)	5.00	4.75	2.50
-Lexical Q. (0-5)	3.20	3.75	1.14
-Gramm. Q. (0-5)	3.00	3.75	.96
-Discur. Q. (0-5)	3.00	4.25	.59
-Enunc. Qu. (0-5)	2.80	4.25	.65
-Pers. Exp. (0-3)	1.60	2.25	.17
-Lexical Quantity	149.80	89.00	40.80
-Eng. Wds.	44.00	3.00	10.73
CONTENT			
Percent Corr.	80.60	77.00	
No. Eng. Ques.	2.00	1.20	
No. Eng. Ans.	4.80	.75	
No. Unans. Ques.	1.00	2.75	

TABLE 19

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE (METROPOLITAN COVARIATE) ON LANGUAGE TESTS FOR COHORT 1 AT GRADE TWO BY SEX

GROUP:	FORMER B.K.	NEW PUPILS	FORMER E.K.		
	Males (6)		Females (16)		
VARIABLES	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	Sig. Level
RAVEN	27.17		25.22		
PEABODY	54.80	54.99	44.18	44.13	.4052
METROPOLITAN	42.80		42.06		
OLM (FR.)					
-Gen. Comp. (0-5)	4.80	4.83	2.87	2.86	.0394
-Lexical Q. (0-5)	2.60	2.63	1.75	1.74	.2252
-Gramm. Q. (0-5)	2.60	2.62	1.56	1.56	.1583
-Discur. Q. (0-5)	2.20	2.22	1.56	1.56	.4702
-Enunc. Qu. (0-5)	1.80	1.82	1.75	1.74	.9333
-Pers. Exp. (0-3)	1.00	1.01	.81	.81	.6821
-Lexixal Quantity	91.00	91.29	64.88	64.78	.4313
-Eng. Wds.	7.60	9.03	30.25	29.80	.2735

TABLE 20

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON CONTENT SUBSCORES FOR COHORT 1 AT GRADE TWO

GROUPS:	FORMER B.K.			NEW PUPILS			
	(N)	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	(N)	UNADJ.$\bar{X}$	ADJ.$\bar{X}$	Sig. Level
USING RAVEN AS COVARIATE	(9)	28.89		(5)	28.40		n.s.
NO. OF CORR. ANS. (100=Max.)							
PERCENT CORRECT		79.00	78.96		75.80	75.67	.5232
NO. ENG. QUES.		1.88	1.78		28.02	28.20	.0001
NO. ENG. ANS.		3.05	3.00		32.20	32.10	.0001
NO. UNANS. QUES.		1.78	1.78		2.00	2.00	.8522
USING METROPOLITAN AS COVARIATE	(8)	39.75		(5)	46.40		.05
NO. OF CORR. ANS. (100=Max.)							
PERCENT CORRECT		78.75	80.05		75.80	73.73	.0733
NO. ENG. QUES.		1.96	2.00		28.26	28.20	.0006
NO. ENG. ANS.		3.13	3.13		32.20	32.19	.0001
NO. UNANS. QUES.		1.79	1.88		2.14	2.00	.7890

TABLE 21

BREAKDOWN OF PUPIL VERBAL EVENTS IN GRADE TWO BY LINGUISTIC GROUP (ENGLISH DOMINANT, BILINGUAL) BY LANGUAGE SPOKEN DURING CLASS (ENGLISH' FRENCH) AND BY PERSONAL REFERENCE (TEACHER, PUPIL)

LEVEL								
1	VERBAL EVENTS							
	95							
2	BY ENGLISH DOMINANT (N=14)				BY BILINGUALS (N=4)			
	53				42			
3	In English		In French		In English		In French	
	21		32		11		31	
4	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P
	12	9	29	3	5	6	31	0

TABLE 22

BREAKDOWN OF PUPIL VERBAL EXCHANGES IN GRADE TWO WITH TEACHERS AND PUPILS BY LINGUISTIC GROUP (ENGLISH, BILINGUAL) AND BY TYPE OF VERBAL INTERACTION (RESPONDING (R) OR INITIATING (I) CONVERSATION)

LEVEL																
1	EXCHANGES															
	95															
2	WITH TEACHERS								WITH PUPILS							
	77								18							
3	By Eng. Dom				By Bilingual				By Eng. Dom.				By Bilingual			
	41				36				12				6			
4	R		I		R		I		R		I		R		I	
	28		13		35		1		2		10		3		3	
5	Eng.	F	Eng.	F	Eng.	F	Eng.	F	Eng.	F	Eng.	F	Eng.	F	Eng.	F
	8	20	4	9	5	30	0	1	1	1	8	2	3	0	3	0

TABLE 23

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO 8 QUESTIONS OF BILINGUAL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE TO PARENTS

1. Would you have sent your child to St. Joseph School: please check each category
   a. if only a one-half day English language kindergarten had been available — Yes 6 No 2
   b. if only a one-half day French language kindergarten had been available — Yes 6 No 1
   c. if a full day English language kindergarten had been available — Yes 4 No 2
   d. if a full day French language kindergarten had been available — Yes 5 No 2

2. Do you think your child enjoyed the French component (afternoon session) of the program? (check one)

Enjoyed very much	6
Enjoyed moderately	3
Enjoyed very little	0

3. To what extent do you think your child benefited (learned something new) from the French component (afternoon session) of the program? (check one)

Benefited very much	6
Benefited moderately	3
Benefited very little	0

4. Would you have preferred for your child a French kindergarten experience that was (check one)

- more structured than the one this year	1
- less structured than the one this year	0
- about as structured as the one this year	8

5. Do you think that, by attending the afternoon session your child learned (check one)

- more French than you expected	2
- less French than you expected	0
- about the same amount as expected	5
- question not appropriate since you attribute your child's knowledge of French to factors outside the class	2

6. Has your child manifested understanding of French when you have been with him/her? (check one)

- on a number of occasions	6
- on a few occasions	1
- rarely	1
- never	0
- question not appropriate since your child is fluent in French	1

7. Has your child attempted to speak French outside of class? (check one)

- on a number of occasions	3
- on a few occasions	5
- rarely	0
- never	0
- question not appropriate since your child is fluent in French	1

8. Would you recommend the St. Joseph Kindergarten Program to others? Yes 8 No ___
   Additional comments and/or suggestions:

APPENDIX A

DISTRIBUTION OF DUTIES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FRENCH COMPONENT OF THE PROGRAMS - KINDERGARTEN, GRADE ONE AND GRADE TWO, 1981-1982

Function	Target Group	Activity	Extent of Involvement	Expected Progress
Teachers	Students	-Teaching -Animation	One half-day for duration of scholastic year (K). Fifty minutes per day (Grades 1 and 2)	To implement minimal objectives of program.
Principal	Teacher Parents Pupils	-Administrative supervision of class -Liaison with parents -Information	As required by pupils, teacher, parents	To meet the needs of those involved and to facilitate collaboration.
Program Consultants	Teacher	-Observation -Direction in the interpretation of the program and modules	Periodic meetings and class visits	To resolve problems related to program. To acquire feedback for program revision and implementation.
Pedagogical Counsellor	Teacher Principal Consultants Administrator Parents	-Information -Coordination -Pedagogical Supervision	Meetings and other forms of communication (telephone, letter)	To effect a productive collaboration. To help provide solutions to problems of implementation.
Administrator	Principal Consultants Pedagogical Counsellor	-Management of budget and materials	Periodic meetings	To assure efficient and satisfactory deployment of resources.

ST. JOSEPH SCHOOL

EXPERIMENTAL BILINGUAL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

- -

To: The parents or guardians of students enrolled in kindergarten at _____

From: The representatives of the Commission scolaire Sainte-Croix:

Mr. Bernard Champagne; Director of English schools.

Mrs.G.Nadeau-Mitchell; Second Language Consultant.

The team of evaluators from McGill Faculty of Education ; M.F. Buteau and H. Gougeon.

A new full-day bilingual kindergarten program is being experimented with in Saint-Joseph of Mount Royal Elementary School with the cooperation of professors from McGill University. It maintains the regular English kindergarten curriculum while providing the additional benefits of a half-day of instruction through French.

For purposes of assessing the effects of this program on the children and of investigating another alternative to existing French instructional programs, a series of tests related to language development must be administered. In order to make comparisons on the language performce between children at Saint-Joseph School and those following other types of kindergarten programs, we will need the cooperation of pupils in other schools. The results of the study would be of interest to the parents of these children as well as to those whose children are participating in the new program.

Testing sessions will take place in December or January and again in May or June and will last about an hour. They will be conducted by trained assistants who are fluent in French and in English and who have experience in dealing with children. Judging from our past experience we believe that the children will find the testing sessions interesting and a pleasant learning experience. As some of the tests assess oral expression, a part of the inverview will be tape-recorded for subsequent analysis.

CENTRE ADMINISTRATIF, 1100 CÔTE VERTU, SAINT-LAURENT, H4L 4V1 -- TÉLÉPHONE 748-6991

APPENDIX B

At the time of transcription pupils' names will be replaced by numbers and the code will be destroyed at the end of the study. The identity of individual pupils will not be revealed and information about the performance of individual students will be confidential. The report of the results of the pilot study will be made available to the parents of all participating children.

We count on your cooperation and would very much appreciate your permission to have your child participate in the evaluation. Please signify your consent to your child's participation in the testing sessions by signing the attached slip and having your child return it to the teacher.

Should you have any questions about the program or the evaluation procedure please contact

Mrs. Geraldine Nadeau-Mitchell
Consultant Second Languages
Commission scolaire Sainte-Croix

at; 748-6991

LA COMMISSION SCOLAIRE
sainte-croix

ST. JOSEPH SCHOOL
EXPERIMENTAL BILINGUAL KINDERGARTEN PROGRAM

Permission is granted for my child _____

to participate in the evaluation of the experimental Bilingual Kindergarten Program described in the attached letter.

_____ Date

_____ Signature of parent or guardian.

CENTRE ADMINISTRATIF, 1100 CÔTE VERTU, SAINT-LAURENT, H4L 4V1 - TÉLÉPHONE: 748-6391

APPENDIX C

INFORMATION FORM

School: Level: Kindergarten

Name:

Sex:

Home address:

Phone:

Date of birth:

Place of birth:

Language (s) spoken at home:

Mother's occupation:

Father's occupation:

(If possible)

Experience in:

	Length	Language
Daycare:		
Nursery School:		
Other:		

Siblings: (e.g. number, age, sex)

ANNEXE D

INTERACTION VERBALE ET SOCIALE

Nom de l'élève: _____ École: _____ Date: _____ Durée de l'observation: de ___ à ___

Activité d'apprentissage en cours: _____ Observateur(rice) _____

CATÉGORIES			ÉNONCÉS DE L'ÉLÈVE
Réaction adressée	A l'enseignante	En séquence à une intervention adressée individuellement	
		En séquence à une intervention adressée à un groupe	
	A un ou plusieurs élèves	Nom des élèves	
Engagement de communication	Avec l'enseignante		
	Avec un ou plusieurs élèves		
Monologue	Situation et contexte.		

69.

APPENDIX E

OBSERVATION SEQUENCE FOR VERBAL BEHAVIOR OF 8 PUPILS (A TO H) FOR 16 TEN-MINUTE BLOCKS BY TWO OBSLRVERS (X AND Y)

OBSERVERS	OBSERVATION BLOCKS	
	FALL	SPRING
	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
X	A B E F C D G H.	C D G H A B E F
Y	C D G H A B E F	A B E F C D G H

APPENDIX F

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR NEW GRADE ONE PUPILS (ST. JOSEPH) FOR FORMER B.K. AND FORMER E.K. PUPILS AT GRADE ONE ON LANGUAGE TESTS AND ON CONTENT PRETESTS AND POSTTESTS

GROUPS	NEW PUPILS			FORMER B.K.			FORMER E.K.		
VARIABLES	N	MEAN	SD	N	MEAN	SD	N	MEAN	SD
OISE	5			14			11		
OISE TOTAL		14.40	12.18		23.21	10.20		7.36	2.58
OISE 1		7.40	7.23		11.86	5.39		3.18	2.27
OISE 2		2.40	2.30		4.21	2.58		1.09	.70
OISE 3		4.60	3.36		7.14	3.21		3.09	1.58
OLM	3			15			10		
Gen. Comp.		3.00	2.00		3.80	1.42		1.30	.95
Lex. Q.		2.00	2.00		2.40	1.35		.60	.70
Gramm. Q.		2.00	2.00		2.12	1.46		.30	.68
Discur. Q.		2.00	2.00		2.33	1.50		.80	.42
Enunc. Q.		2.00	2.00		2.00	1.73		.20	.63
Pers. Exp.		.67	.58		.80	.41		.10	.32
Lexical Quantity		47.33	46.52		95.73	62.24		15.60	13.69
Eng. Wds.		24.67	22.81		29.80	27.77		39.20	29.09
CONTENT (pretest)	9			15					
No. of Corr. Ans.		61.89	10.68		66.07	8.27			
Percent Correct		69.67	11.95		74.13	9.26			
No. of Eng. Ques.		17.00	8.97		4.80	6.93			
No. of Eng. Ans.		37.33	15.57		18.53	14.90			
No. Unans. Ques.		1.44	1.94		.87	1.60			
CONTENT (posttest)	8			15					
No. of Corr. Ans.		63.25	9.38		68.53	9.18			
Percent Correct		71.25	10.67		77.07	10.33			
No. of Eng. Ques.		13.25	10.29		4.80	7.13			
No. of Eng. Ans.		33.75	18.30		20.33	17.76			
No. of Unans. Ques.		1.38	1.51		.60	.99			

APPENDIX G

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON FRENCH LANGUAGE TESTS FOR GRADE 3 - TOTAL GROUPS

	TOTAL SCORES (21)		MALES (8)		FEMALES (13)	
VARIABLE	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
OISE TOTAL	33.38	9.70	27.13	11.95	37.23	5.61
OISE 1	15.19	5.27	11.63	5.95	17.38	3.45
OISE 2	6.57	2.38	5.50	2.83	7.23	1.88
OISE 3	11.62	2.87	10.00	3.96	12.62	1.33
FRENCH READING	7.86	5.46	7.50	6.00	8.08	5.35

APPENDIX H

LA MATERNELLE

Opinionnaire

Pour nous aider à réviser et à améliorer constamment le programme dont nous faisons l'évaluation, auriez-vous l'obligeance de remplir avec le plus de précision possible le questionnaire suivant au sujet de la partie française du programme de maternelle bilingue.
Nous vous remercions d'avance de votre précieuse collaboration.

Première partie

Veuillez indiquer, par un x placé dans la colonne appropriée, dans quelle mesure vous partagez les opinions exprimées ci-dessous au sujet du programme expérimental que vous enseignez.

Code: 0 - Pas du tout d'accord
1 - J'ai de fortes réserves
2 - J'ai quelques réserves
3 - Je suis généralement d'accord
4 - Je suis complètement d'accord

	0	1	2	3	4
1. Les enfants s'intéressent beaucoup au thème des animaux.					
2. Le premier thème est trop facile.....					
3. Le thème de l'alimentation pourrait s'enseigner avant Noël.....					
4. Le thème des transports s'enseigne mieux que celui des vêtements.....					
5. Le matériel didactique disponible est satisfaisant pour le thème des changements climatiques.....					
6. L'imprécision des objectifs linguistiques permet beaucoup de flexibilité à l'enseignante.....					
7. Le programme français recouvre les connaissances vues en maternelle anglaise.....					
8. Les enfants apprennent davantage dans les activités libres que dans des activités structurées.....					
9. Le programme permet aux enfants d'utiliser des objets et du matériel qu'ils apportent de chez eux.....					

Deuxième partie

Questions ouvertes

1. Quel est le thème le plus facile à enseigner?

   Pourquoi?

2. Quel est le thème qui requiert le plus de temps?

   Pourquoi?

3. Quel est le thème qui demande le plus de préparation?

   Pourquoi?

APPENDIX H

Deuxième partie (suite)

Questions ouvertes

4. A peu près quel pourcentage du temps est consacré à l'enseignement structuré du programme?

   Quelques commentaires d'explication:

5. Pouvez-vous suggérer des modifications qui pourraient être apportées au programme et au régime pédagogique et qui amèneraient les enfants à apprendre le français davantage?

6. Comme il s'agit d'un programme expérimental nous savons que ce programme, pour être productif, exige de la préparation et de la planification de la part de l'enseignante. Voudriez-vous nous décrire le genre de préparation quotidienne ou hebdomadaire que vous a imposé ce programme.

7. Quels sont les exercices qui à votre avis ont été les plus profitables aux enfants du point de vue de l'apprentissage du français?

8. Quel est le matériel didactique dont vous disposiez qui semble avoir été le plus utile dans votre enseignement du programme?

9. Quel matériel supplémentaire devrait être acheté l'an prochain pour faciliter la tâche de l'enseignante et surtout pour soutenir et motiver les enfants dans leur apprentissage du français?

10. Quelles sont les acquisitions les plus marquantes que vous avez pu constater chez la plupart des élèves de janvier à juin selon les aspects suivants de l'apprentissage du français?

    Prononciation:

    Vocabulaire:

    Grammaire:

    Expression:

    Compréhension:

11. Quels commentaires et quelles suggestions pouvez-vous formuler, selon les éléments énumérés ci-dessous, pour aider les autorités, les parents, les enfants, les assistantes de recherche et nous-mêmes à améliorer le programme pour que les enfants profitent au maximum du programme expérimental:

    Méthodologie:

    Horaire:

    Matériel didactique:

    Activités:

    Testing:

    Autres:

APPENDIX I

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
3700 McTAVISH STREET, MONTREAL 112, QUE., CANADA
McGILL UNIVERSITY

June 2, 1982

Dear Parents:

This is the third year that the Bilingual Kindergarten program has been offered at St. Joseph Elementary School and the third year of its evaluation.

To help assess the effect of the program so that changes and improvements may be implemented in the coming year, we would appreciate your opinion regarding the French component (afternoon session) of the Kindergarten. Needless to say individual questionnaires will be kept confidential. We hope that you will take a few minutes to complete the attached questionnaire and to return it before June 30, 1982, using the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

We thank you for your cooperation, wish you a pleasant summer and look forward to seeing your youngster next year in Grade One.

Cordially yours,

M. F. Buteau

H. Gougeon

Madgelhayne F. Buteau
Helen Gougeon

/lt

APPENDIX I

SAINT JOSEPH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
SAINTE-CROIX SCHOOL COMMISSION

QUESTIONNAIRE

addressed to the parents whose children
have attended the Bilingual Kindergarten Class in 1981-82

Please fill in and return this questionnaire before June 30, 1982 to

Professors M. Buteau and H. Gougeon
McGill Faculty of Education
3700 McTavish Street
Montréal H3A 1Y2

1. Would you have sent your child to St. Joseph school: please check each category

   a. if only a one-half day English language kindergarten had been available — Yes ___ No ___

   b. if only a one-half day French language kindergarten had been available — Yes ___ No ___

   c. if a full day English language kindergarten had been available — Yes ___ No ___

   d. if a full day French language kindergarten had been available — Yes ___ No ___

2. To what extent do you think your child enjoyed the French component (afternoon session) of the program? (check one)

   Enjoyed very much ___
   Enjoyed moderately ___
   Enjoyed very little ___

3. To what extent do you think your child benefited (learned something new) from the French component (afternoon session) of the program? (check one)

   Benefited very much ___
   Benefited moderately ___
   Benefited very little ___

4. Would you have preferred for your child a French kindergarten experience that was (check one)

   - more structured than the one this year ___
   - less structured than the one this year ___
   - about as structured as the one this year ___

5. Do you think that, by attending the afternoon session your child learned (check one) -

   - more French than you expected ___
   - less French than you expected ___
   - about the same amount as expected ___
   - question not appropriate since you attribute your child's knowledge of French to factors outside the class ___

6. Has your child manifested understanding of French when you have been with him/her? (check one)

   - on a number of occasions ___
   - on a few occasions ___
   - rarely ___
   - never ___

7. Has your child attempted to speak French outside of class? (check one)

- on a number of occasions ___
- on a few occasions ___
- rarely ___
- never ___
- question not appropriate since your child is fluent in French ___

8. Which activities or practices in the French component of the kindergarten program do you believe are particularly beneficial and hence should be retained. (Please elaborate below)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. Which activities or practices (if any) in the French component of the kindergarten would you like to see eliminated or improved (Please elaborate below)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Would you recommend the St. Joseph Kindergarten Program to others? Yes ___ No ___

Additional comments and/or suggestions:

Signature _____
(optional)

APPENDIX J

QUESTIONNAIRE

Les sciences humaines intégrées à l'enseignement du français langue seconde

Première année

Pour nous aider à améliorer constamment le programme dont nous faisons l'évaluation, auriez-vous l'obligeance de remplir le questionnaire suivant.
Nous vous remercions d'avance de votre précieuse collaboration.

I. Comment l'orientation générale du programme pourrait-elle être explicitée, s'il y a lieu?

II. Qu'est-ce que vous pensez, du point de vue de leur réalisme, difficulté, intérêt, utilité, de chacun des objectifs terminaux,

A. Sur le plan cognitif et éducatif?

1.

2.

3.

B. Sur le plan langagier?

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

III. Pensez-vous pouvoir [illegible] à couvrir le programme régulier de sciences humaines?

IV. Quels sont les exercices qui, à votre avis, ont été les plus profitables aux enfants du point de vue de l'apprentissage du français?

V. Quel est le matériel didactique dont vous disposiez qui semble avoir été le plus utile dans votre enseignement du programme?

VI. Quel matériel didactique supplémentaire devrait être acheté l'an prochain pour faciliter la tâche de l'enseignante et surtout pour soutenir et motiver les enfants dans leur apprentissage du français?

VII. Quelles activités d'apprentissage semblent convenir le mieux à la catégorie d'élèves que vous avez connue en première année?

VIII. Quelles sont les acquisitions les plus marquantes que vous avez pu constater chez la plupart des élèves, de janvier à juin, selon les aspects suivants de l'apprentissage du français?

Prononciation:

Facilité:

Vocabulaire:

Grammaire:

Expression:

Compréhension:

IX. Quels commentaires et quelles suggestions pouvez-vous formuler pour aider les autorités, les parents, les enfants, les assistantes de recherche et nous-mêmes à améliorer le programme pour que les enfants profitent au maximum du programme expérimental?

X. De toutes les connaissances qui sont proposées comme objectifs du programme, quelles sont celles qui, à votre avis,

A. étaient déjà acquises par la plupart des élèves?

B. ont été acquises par la plupart des élèves à la suite de votre enseignement?

XI. Commentaires supplémentaires

APPENDIX K
QUESTIONNAIRE

LES SCIENCES HUMAINES INTEGREES À L'ENSEIGNEMENT DU FRANÇAIS LANGUE SECONDE

Deuxième année

Pour nous aider à améliorer constamment la programme dont nous faisons l'évaluation, auriez-vous l'obligeance de remplir le questionnaire suivant.
Nous vous remercions d'avance de votre précieuse collaboration.

I. Comment l'orientation générale du programme pourrait-elle être explicitée, s'il y a lieu?

II. Qu'est-ce que vous pensez du manuel dont vous vous êtes servie pour l'enseignement des sciences humaines en deuxième année

A. du point de vue des thèmes proposés dans ce manuel?

B. du point de vue des indications pédagogiques?

C. du point de vue de l'utilité de ce manuel pour l'enseignement intégré du français?

III. Nommer trois types particuliers d'exercices qui, à votre avis, ont été très profitables aux élèves.
A.

B.

C.

IV. Nommer trois activités d'apprentissage qui, selon votre expérience, conviennent le mieux à l'enseignement intégré du français et des sciences humaines.
A.

B.

C.

V. Indiquez, selon votre perception, le degré de progrès que la plupart des élèves ont atteint dans les aspects suivants de l'apprentissage du français:

	Peu 1	2	3	4	Beaucoup 5
Prononciation					
Facilité					
Vocabulaire					
Grammaire					
Expression					
Compréhension					

VI. Remarques supplémentaires:
A. Points faibles du programme

B. Suggestions pratiques: